

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO	, F.	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/075,348 02/14/2002		02/14/2002	Jotham W. Coc	PC10030D	9919
23913	7590	01/11/2005		EXAMINER	
PFIZER I	NC		COLEMAN, BRENDA LIBBY		
150 EAST	42ND STR	EET			
5TH FLOOR - STOP 49				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK, NY 10017-5612				1624	

DATE MAILED: 01/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/075,348	WADSWORTH ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Brenda Coleman	1624					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
Period f r Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	86(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 Oo</u>	ctober 2004.						
	action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	ice except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6,8,10,15-23 and 25-35</u> is/are pendi	ng in the application						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
							· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	r.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex-	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	. , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,						
1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		on No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	ity documents have been receive	ed in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau	(PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not receive	d.					
Attachment(s)		,					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ite					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal Page 1990. 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)					

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-6, 8, 10, 15-23 and 25-35 are pending in the application.

This action is in response to applicants' amendment filed October 25, 2004.

Claim 1 has been amended and claim 24 has been canceled.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed October 25, 2004 have been fully considered with the following effect:

1. With regards to the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph rejection labeled paragraph

1) maintained in the last office action, the applicants' amendments and remarks have

been fully considered but they are not found persuasive. The applicants' stated that the
specific compounds that are embraced by the cited classes are common knowledge to
those skilled in the art. However, the additional active ingredient within the terms a

muscarinic agonist, a neurotrophic factor, an agent that slows or arrests

Alzheimer's disease, an amyloid aggregation inhibitior, a secretase inhibitor, a tau
kinase inhibitor, a neuronal anitinflammatory agent and an estrogen-like
therapeutic agent is not defined in the specification. The terms are of indeterminate
scope.

The applicants point to several journal articles for support in the use of some of the terms listed above. However, these references "Muscarinic agonists and antagonists in the treatment of Alzheimer's disease", W. Greenlee, et al, *II Farmaco* vol. 56, #4, **April 1, 2001**, pp247-250; "Therapeutic Strategies in Alzheimer's Disease: M1 Muscarinic Agonists", A. Fisher, *Jpn. J. Pharmacol.* Vol. 84, 101-112 (2000); "β-Amyloid"

Art Unit: 1624

Aggregation Inhibitors for the Treatment of Alzheimer's Disease: Dream or Reality?" P. Talaga, *Mini Reviews in medicinal Chemistry*, Vol.1, 175-186 (**2001**); "Muscarinic agonists- a logical approach for AD?" A. Korczyn, *Alzheimer Insights Online*, vol. 7, No. 4 (see References), a catalog entry for commercially available secretase inhibitors which provides references (see references 2-5) on a specific secretase inhibitor and an abstract of the article "Limited efficacy of pentoxifylline as anti-inflammatory agent in experimental pneumococcal meningitis, G. Zysk, et al., *Clin Exp Immunol.*, Vol. 107(3), 458-461 (1997). The Applicants' argue that the references detailing the use of the terms outlined above are sufficient in the enablement of the claimed invention. The applicant's arguments in reference to the journal articles other than the efficacy of pentoxifylline as an anti-inflammatory agent are not persuasive in that the articles were not public knowledge at the time of filing. See MPEP 2164.05(a)

2164.05(a) Specification Must Be Enabling as of the Filing Date

The state of the art, existing at the filing date of the application is used to determine whether a particular disclosure is enabling as of the filing date. Publications dated after the filing date providing information publicly first disclosed after the filing date generally cannot be used to show what was known at the time of filing. In re Gunn, 537 F.2d 1123, 1128, 190 USPQ 402, 405 06 (CCPA 1976); In re Budnick, 537 F.2d 535, 538, 190 USPQ 422, 424 (CCPA 1976) (In general, if an applicant seeks to use a patent to prove the state of the art for the purpose of the enablement requirement, the patent must have an issue date earlier than the effective filing date of the application.). While a later dated publication cannot supplement an insufficient disclosure in a prior

dated application to make it enabling, applicant can offer the testimony of an expert based on the publication as evidence of the level of skill in the art at the time the application was filed. Gould v. Quigg, 822 F.2d 1074, 1077, 3 USPQ2d 1302, 1304 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The nature of the instant invention, has claims which embrace substituted 10-aza-tricyclo[6.3.1.0^{2,7}]dodeca-2(7),3,5-triene compounds. The instant compounds of formula (I) wherein the additional active ingredients are not described in the disclosure in such a way the one of ordinary skill in the art would no how to prepare the various compounds suggested by claims 1-6, 8, 10 and 15-35. In view of the lack of direction provided in the specification regarding starting materials, the lack of working examples, and the general unpredictability of chemical reactions, it would take an undue amount of experimentation for one skilled in the art to make the claimed compounds and therefore practice the invention.

Claims 1-6, 8, 10, 15-23 and 25-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention, for reasons of record and stated above.

2. With regards to the obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1-6, 8, 10, 15-19, 22, 24-28 and 30-35, labeled paragraph 4) maintained in the last office action, the applicants' requested that this rejection be held in abeyance at this time.

Application/Control Number: 10/075,348

Art Unit: 1624

Claims 1-6, 8, 10, 15-19, 22, 25-28 and 30-35 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-34 of copending Application No. 10/348,381, for reasons of record and stated above.

Page 5

3. With regards to the obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1-6, 8, 10, 15-19, 22, 24-28 and 30-35, labeled paragraph 5) maintained in the last office action, the applicants' requested that this rejection be held in abeyance at this time.

Claims 1-6, 8, 10, 15-19, 22, 25-28 and 30-35 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-34 of copending Application No. 10/348,399, for reasons of record and stated above.

- 4. The applicant's amendments and arguments are sufficient to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejections labeled a) and b) of the last office action, which are hereby **withdrawn**. However, with regards to the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejections labeled c) the applicant's amendments and remarks have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
 - The applicants' stated that claim 1 recites that formula 1 may have $R^1 = H$, $R^2 = H$ and $R^3 = -CONR^5R^6$ wherein R^5 may be H and R^6 may be C_1 alkyl which corresponds to the compound N^1 -[10-azatricyclo[6.3.1.0^{2,7}]dodeca-2(7),3,5-trien-4-yl]acetamide. However, the nomenclature is such that the 10-azatricyclo[6.3.1.0^{2,7}]dodeca-2(7),3,5-trien-4-yl ring system is attached to the

Art Unit: 1624

nitrogen atom of the acetamide as shown by the nomenclature assigned by ChemDraw.

 $N-(10-\text{Aza-tricyclo}[6.3.1.0^{2,7}]\text{dodeca-}2(7),3,5-\text{trien-}4-\text{yl})-\text{acetamide}$

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, for reasons of record and stated above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brenda Coleman whose telephone number is 571-272-0665. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson can be reached on 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Application/Control Number: 10/075,348

Art Unit: 1624

Page 7

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Brenda Coleman

Primary Examiner Art Unit 1624

January 6, 2005